On the failure of Bell's theorem

Gyula Bene
Institute for Solid State Physics, Eötvös University, Múzeum krt. 6-8, H-1088 Budapest, Hungary
(February 1, 2008)

arXiv:quant-ph/9706054v1 24 Jun 1997

Using a new approach to quantum mechanics [1], [2] we revisit Hardy's proof [3] for Bell's theorem and point out a loophole in it. We also demonstrate on this example that quantum mechanics is a local realistic theory.

03.65.Bz

Bell's famous theorem [4] states that no local realistic theory can fully reproduce quantum mechanical correlations. There are a number of very clear and convincing proofs for this statement, both using inequalities [4]- [7] and without them [8]- [11], [3]. Certainly, all these proofs are logically correct, so they can fail only if one can show that tacitly all the time there has been made some natural-looking extra assumption beyond realism and locality. If such an assumption is uncovered, then the usual contradiction appearing in the proofs of Bell's theorem may imply the failure of this extra assumption rather than that of the principle of locality or realism. It has recently been demonstrated on the example of Bell's inequality that it is actually the case [1], [2]. In the present paper we point out the failure of Bell's theorem by revisiting Hardy's proof [3] which is probably the simplest and most powerful one and does not use inequalities.

Suppose that an EPR-Bell experiment is performed on a two-particle system. The results of the measurements (in a particular run) are denoted by a and b, respectively, and the hidden variable characterizing the original two-particle state be λ. Realism is equivalent with the statement that each of these three quantities is an element of the reality. The extra assumption mentioned above is the following:

realism (as expressed above) implies that the quantities a, b, λ can be in principle compared.

Without this assumption one could not assign a joint probability to the set $\{a, b, \lambda\}$ or could not speak about events when these quantities simultaneously have certain definite values. Certainly this assumption looks rather obvious, however, it does not follow on a purely logical ground. Formally, the comparability of the above quantities would mean that also the *set* $\{a, b, \lambda\}$ is an *element* of reality. However, the condition that a, b and λ are elements of the reality implies only that the set $\{a, b, \lambda\}$ is a *subset* of the reality.

In the recent theory [1], [2] which underlies our considerations, the role of the quantities a, b and λ is played by certain quantum states, and their reality means that any of them can be determined by a suitable measurement with unit probability, without changing that state. It does not imply, however, that all the three appropriate measurements can be performed *simultaneously* without changing the states and their correlations. Indeed, the measurement which does not disturbe the state corresponding to λ does change another state, which leads to a change of the correlation between a and b. Therefore, the states corresponding to a, b and λ exist, yet it is physically meaningless to speak about events of the type $a \wedge b \wedge \lambda$.

Let us briefly review the theory [1], [2]. According to it one and the same system S can be characterized by a multitude of states $\hat{\rho}_S(R_1)$, $\hat{\rho}_S(R_2)$, ..., where the *quantum reference systems* R_1, R_2, ... are also physical systems which contain the system S. These states are all elements of the reality, as in principle any of them can be learned with unit probability by a suitable measurement which does not disturbe that state. Mathematically these states are positive definite hermitian operators with unit trace, and they act on the Hilbert space of the system S. The theory keeps the Schrödinger equation unchanged, but rejects the idea of the collapse of the wave function. The interrelation of the states is specified by a few new postulates which allow for the description of the measurements themselves as usual interactions between physical systems. The postulates (which will be needed in the discussion below) are the following:

Postulate 1. *The state $\hat{\rho}_S(S)$ is always a single dyad $|\psi_S >< \psi_S|$.* We shall call both $\hat{\rho}_S(S)$ and $|\psi_S >$ the internal state of S.

Postulate 2. $\hat{\rho}_S(R) = Tr_{R\setminus S}|\psi_R >< \psi_R|$

Postulate 3. *If the reference system $R = I$ is an isolated one* [1] *then the state $\hat{\rho}_S(I)$ commutes with the internal state $\hat{\rho}_S(S)$.*

Postulate 4. *The result of a measurement is contained unambigously in the internal state of the measuring device.*

Postulate 5. *If there are n ($n = 1, 2, 3, ...$) disjointed physical systems, denoted by $S_1, S_2, ...S_n$, all contained in the isolated reference system I and having the possible internal states $|\phi_{S_1,j} >$*

[1] We define an isolated system as such a system which has not been interacting with the outside world. In contrast, a closed system is such a system that is not interacting with any other system at the given instant of time (but might have interacted in the past).

, ..., $|\phi_{S_n,j}>$, respectively, then the joint probability that $|\phi_{S_i,j_i}>$ coincides with the internal state of S_i $(i = 1, ..n)$ is given by

$$P(S_1, j_1, ..., S_n, j_n) = Tr_{S_1+...+S_n}[\hat{\pi}_{S_1,j_1}...\hat{\pi}_{S_n,j_n}\hat{\rho}_{S_1+...+S_n}(I)], \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{\pi}_{S_i,j_i} = |\phi_{S_i,j_i}><\phi_{S_i,j_i}|$.

Let us recall now Hardy's proof [3] for Bell's theorem[2]. The initial state of the two particle system $P_1 + P_2$ is

$$|\psi>_{P_1+P_2} = \alpha|+_1>|+_2> -\beta|-_1>|-_2>, \quad (2)$$

where α and β are real positive numbers with $\alpha^2+\beta^2 = 1$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$. One defines the normalized states

$$|u_i> = b|+_i> +a|-_i>$$
$$|v_i> = -a|+_i> +b|-_i>,$$

where

$$a = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}}, \quad b = \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}}.$$

Obviously, $<u_i|v_i> = 0$. Let us define further normalized states

$$|c_i> = A|u_i> +B|v_i>$$
$$|d_i> = -B|u_i> +A|v_i>,$$

where

$$A = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha\beta}{1-\alpha\beta}}, \quad B = \frac{\beta-\alpha}{\sqrt{1-\alpha\beta}}.$$

Again, $<c_i|d_i> = 0$ follows. Consider now the observables U_i and D_i corresponding to the operators $\hat{U}_i = |u_i><u_i|$ and $\hat{D}_i = |d_i><d_i|$, respectively. Now one considers four different measurements and calculates their outcome according to standard quantum mechanics.

1. If U_1 and U_2 are measured (where the indices refer to the corresponding particles), then $U_1U_2 = 0$.
2. If D_1 and U_2 are measured, then $D_1 = 1$ implies $U_2 = 1$.
3. If U_1 and D_2 are measured, then $D_2 = 1$ implies $U_1 = 1$.
4. If D_1 and D_2 are measured, then $D_1 = 1$ and $D_2 = 1$ happens with probability $\alpha^2\beta^2(\alpha-\beta)^2/(1-\alpha\beta)^2$.

[2]Nearly the same notations are used as in [3], however, we renormalize the states by some -1-s and i-s, in order to have everywhere real coefficients.

Now the argument goes on as follows. Suppose that one measures D_1 and D_2, and at some (unknown) value λ of the hidden parameter (which characterizes the original two particle state) $D_1(\lambda) = 1$ and $D_2(\lambda) = 1$ occurs. As can be seen above (cf. item 4.), there is a finite probability for that. But then item 2. and item 3. imply (provided that the principle of locality holds), that at the same value of the hidden parameter $U_2(\lambda) = 1$ and $U_1(\lambda) = 1$, that contradicts item 1., which states that this situation cannot happen. The conclusion of Ref. [3] is that the principle of locality fails.

Let us consider now the above situation from the point of view of the new theory [1], [2]. The initial state $|\psi>_{P_1+P_2}$ of the two particle system corresponds to the initial internal state $\hat{\rho}_{P_1+P_2}(P_1+P_2)$ (cf. **Postulate 1.**). Let us calculate now the state $\hat{\rho}_{P_1}(P_1+P_2)$. According to **Postulate 2.**, it is

$$\hat{\rho}_{P_1}(P_1+P_2) = |+_1>\alpha^2<+_1| + |-_1>\beta^2<-_1|. \quad (3)$$

Assuming that initially $P_1 + P_2$ is an isolated system[3] we can apply **Postulate 3.**. We get that the internal state $\hat{\rho}_{P_1}(P_1)$ is either $|+_1><+_1|$ with probability α^2 (as implied by **Postulate 5.** with $n = 1$) or $|-_1><-_1|$ with probability β^2. Similarly, we get that $\hat{\rho}_{P_2}(P_2)$ is either $|+_2><+_2|$ with probability α^2 or $|-_2><-_2|$ with probability β^2. Applying now **Postulate 5.** with $n = 2$ we get that $\hat{\rho}_{P_1}(P_1) = |+_1><+_1|$ and $\hat{\rho}_{P_2}(P_2) = |-_2><-_2|$ cannot simultaneously happen, and $\hat{\rho}_{P_1}(P_1) = |-_1><-_1|$ and $\hat{\rho}_{P_2}(P_2) = |+_2><+_2|$ cannot happen, either. In other terms, if the internal state of P_1 is $|+_1>$, then the internal state of P_2 is $|+_2>$, and if the internal state of P_1 is $|-_1>$, then the internal state of P_2 is $|-_2>$. We shall say briefly that the internal state of P_1 and that of P_2 are uniquely related.

Let us denote the eigenstates of the measured observable by $|\xi_j^{(i)}>$ $(i, j = 1, 2)$. This means that $|\xi_1^{(i)}>$ $(|\xi_2^{(i)}>)$ can be either $|u_i>$ $(|v_i>)$ or $|c_i>$ $(|d_i>)$. The dynamics of the measurement be given by the relations (these are assumed to be approximately the same as that one would get from the time dependent Schrödinger equation)

$$|\xi_j^{(i)}>|m_0^{(i)}> \rightarrow |\xi_j^{(i)}>|m_j^{(i)}>, \quad (4)$$

where $|m_0^{(i)}>$ is the initial internal state of the i-th measuring device and $|m_j^{(i)}>$ describes the measuring device when it displays the j-th result.

[3]In a more rigorous treatment one should also include the preparation process of the state $|\psi>_{P_1+P_2}$. This, however, does not have any significant influence on the final results. For such a treatment (in connection with the EPR paradox) see Ref. [1].

The initial internal state of the system $P_1+P_2+M_1+M_2$ is

$$(\alpha|+_1>|+_2>-\beta|-_1>|-_2>)\,|m_0^{(1)}>|m_0^{(2)}> \ . \quad (5)$$

Using again **Postulate 1.**, **Postulate 2.** and **Postulate 3.** as above, one can show that the initial internal state of the subsystem P_1+M_1 is either $|+_1>|m_0^{(1)}>$ or
$|-_1>|m_0^{(1)}>$, so the initial internal state of P_i is uniquely related to that of P_i+M_i. Moreover, as P_i+M_i is a closed system , its initial internal state is uniquely related to its final internal state. This latter is (using Eq. (4)) either

$$|\phi_+>=\sum_j <\xi_j^{(i)}|+_1>|\xi_j^{(i)}>|m_j^{(i)}> \quad (6)$$

or

$$|\phi_->=\sum_j <\xi_j^{(i)}|-_1>|\xi_j^{(i)}>|m_j^{(i)}> \ . \quad (7)$$

Thus we conclude that the initial internal state of P_i is uniquely related to the final internal state of P_i+M_i. We can check this if we calculate first the final internal state of the isolated system $P_1+P_2+M_1+M_2$ and from that determine what can be the final internal state of P_i+M_i. We get for the final internal state of $P_1+P_2+M_1+M_2$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j,k}\Big(&\alpha<\xi_j^{(1)}|+_1><\xi_k^{(2)}|+_2>\\ &-\beta<\xi_j^{(1)}|-_1><\xi_k^{(2)}|-_2>\Big)\\ &\times|\xi_j^{(1)}>|m_j^{(1)}>|\xi_k^{(2)}>|m_k^{(2)}> \ . \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Using **Postulate 2.** we get for
$\hat\rho_{P_1+M_1}(P_1+P_2+M_1+M_2)$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j,j',k}\Big(&\alpha<\xi_j^{(1)}|+_1><\xi_k^{(2)}|+_2>\\ &-\beta<\xi_j^{(1)}|-_1><\xi_k^{(2)}|-_2>\Big)\\ &\times\Big(\alpha<\xi_{j'}^{(1)}|+_1><\xi_k^{(2)}|+_2>\\ &-\beta<\xi_{j'}^{(1)}|-_1><\xi_k^{(2)}|-_2>\Big)^*\\ &\times|\xi_j^{(1)}>|m_j^{(1)}><m_{j'}^{(1)}|<\xi_{j'}^{(1)}|\\ =&|\phi_+>\alpha^2<\phi_+|+|\phi_->\beta^2<\phi_-|\,. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here the completeness relation $\sum_k|\xi_k^{(2)}><\xi_k^{(2)}|=\hat 1$ has been used. As we see, the eigenstates of
$\hat\rho_{P_1+M_1}(P_1+P_2+M_1+M_2)$ are just (6) and (7). Therefore, according to **Postulate 3.** we find that the internal state of P_1+M_1 is indeed either (6) or (7), moreover, **Postulate 5.** implies that the corresponding probability is α^2 and β^2, respectively.

If we want to know what the result of a measurement is, according to **Postulate 4.** we have to calculate the internal state of the corresponding measuring device. In order to do that first we determine e.g.
$\hat\rho_{M_1}(P_1+P_2+M_1+M_2)$ from Eq. (8) by applying **Postulate 2.**. We get

$$\hat\rho_{M_1}(P_1+P_2+M_1+M_2)=\sum_j|m_j^{(1)}>p_j<m_j^{(1)}|\,, \quad (10)$$

where $p_j=\alpha^2\left|<\xi_j^{(1)}|+_1>\right|^2+\beta^2\left|<\xi_j^{(1)}|-_1>\right|^2$. Let us emphasize that it is independent of the second measurement process. According to **Postulate 3.** this implies that the internal state of the first measuring device is either $|m_1^{(1)}>$ or $|m_2^{(1)}>$. This is what we expected, as these states describe the measuring device displaying a definite result. The corresponding probabilities (according to **Postulate 5.**) are the eigenvalues $\alpha^2\left|<\xi_j^{(1)}|+_1>\right|^2+\beta^2\left|<\xi_j^{(1)}|-_1>\right|^2$. Note that this expression may be interpreted as one intuitively expects: α^2 and β^2 are the probabilities that the initial internal state of P_1 is $|+_1>$ or $|-_1>$, respectively, while the factors $\left|<\xi_j^{(1)}|+_1>\right|^2$, $\left|<\xi_j^{(1)}|-_1>\right|^2$ are the conditional probability to get the j-th result provided that the the initial internal state of P_1 has been $|+_1>$ or $|-_1>$, respectively.

Up to now we have seen that the initial internal state of P_1 uniquely determines the first measurement process (i.e., the time evolution of the internal state of P_1+M_1) and determines the result of the first measurement in the usual probabilistic sense. The analogous statement holds for the second measurement. We have also seen that the two measurement processes do not influence each other. Therefore, our theory satisfies the principle of locality, and the role of λ (the hidden variable) is played by the initial internal state of one of the particles [4].

Let us consider now the correlations between the measurements. As we already know the possible internal states of the measuring devices, **Postulate 5.** (with $n=2$) can be directly applied. The result is

$$\begin{aligned}P(M_1,j,M_2,k)=\Big|&\alpha<\xi_j^{(1)}|+_1><\xi_k^{(2)}|+_2>\\ &-\beta<\xi_j^{(1)}|-_1><\xi_k^{(2)}|-_2>\Big|^2 \ . \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Inserting here $|u_i>(|v_i>)$ or $|c_i>(|d_i>)$ for $|\xi_1^{(i)}>(|\xi_2^{(i)}>)$ we can readily recover the above items 1.-4., i.e., the standard quantum mechanical predictions. This means that our theory is a counterexample to Bell's theorem, as it is a local realistic theory, yet it fully reproduces the standard quantum mechanical correlations.

---

[4] It is enough to consider only one of them, as their initial internal states are uniquely related.

What is then wrong with the argument of [3]? That argument relies on the existence of an event when $D_1 = 1$, $D_2 = 1$ *and* λ has a definite value. In our case this can be translated to the statement that there is a nonzero probability that { *initially the internal state of* P_1 *coincides with e.g.* $|+_1>$ **and** *finally the internal state of* M_1 *coincides with* $|m_2^{(1)}>$ **and** *the internal state of* M_2 *coincides with* $|m_2^{(2)}>$ }.However, it turns out that such a probability cannot be defined within the framework of our theory, and it is physically meaningless to speak about the above event. Let us show this in more detail. The first difficulty when trying to find a suitable expression for the probability in question arises because we want to compare states given at different times, while the theory provides us only with equal time correlations. However, the initial internal state of P_1 is uniquely related to the final internal state of $P_1 + M_1$, so we may try to find the probability of the event that { *the final internal state of* $P_1 + M_1$ *coincides with* $\sum_j <\xi_j^{(1)}|+_1> |\xi_j^{(1)}> |m_j^{(1)}>$[5] **and** *the final internal state of* M_1 *coincides with* $|m_2^{(1)}>$ **and** *the final internal state of* M_2 *coincides with* $|m_2^{(2)}>$ }.But now the problem is that the systems involved (i.e., $P_1 + M_1$, M_1 and M_2) are not disjointed, while **Postulate 5.** applies for disjointed systems. If we yet try to apply Eq. (1) directly, we get the expression

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha <+_1|\xi_2^{(1)}><+_2|\xi_2^{(2)}> \\ &\times\Big(\alpha <\xi_2^{(1)}|+_1><\xi_2^{(2)}|+_2> \\ &-\beta <\xi_2^{(1)}|-_1><\xi_2^{(2)}|-_2>\Big) \\ &= \frac{\alpha^2\beta^4(\beta-\alpha)}{(\alpha+\beta)(1-\alpha\beta)^2}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

If $\alpha > \beta$, this expression becomes negative. If $\alpha < \beta$, this expression becomes larger than $P(M_1, 2, M_2, 2) = P(D_1, D_2) = \alpha^2\beta^2(\alpha-\beta)^2/(1-\alpha\beta)^2$, showing that in that case the "probability" of the event obtained by replacing $|+_1>$ with $|-_1>$ is negative. Thus we see that no reasonable definition of the probability in question can be given. This also means that the events (a, b) cannot be classified according to the value of λ, hence no contradiction can be derived.

In more physical terms the situation is the following. As it has been shown in Refs. [1], [2] any state can in principle be measured without disturbing it. However, if we try to perform such nondisturbing measurements on several systems simultaneously, it will not change the states and their correlations only if the systems are disjointed. In that case the measurement of one system does not disturbe the other one. But if the systems are not disjointed, a measurement which does not disturbe one particular state will disturbe another one. Therefore, in such a case one should conclude, that although the states individually exist, they cannot be compared.[6] This circumstance has not been taken into account in the proofs of Bell's theorem. This made possible the construction of the local realistic theory [1], [2], which is an explicit counterexample to Bell's theorem.

Acknowledgements

The author wants to thank for the hospitality of the *Institut für Festkörperphysik, Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH* where a substantial part of the work has been done. This work has been partially supported by the OMFB (Hungary) and the BMBF (Germany) within the framework of a Hungarian-German joint project, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences under Grant Nos. OTKA T 017493, OTKA F 17166 and OTKA F 19266.

[1] Gy.Bene, *Quantum reference systems: a new framework for quantum mechanics*, Physica **A** (1997), in press, see also at the web site http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/quant-ph/9703021

[2] Gy.Bene, *Quantum phenomena do not violate the principle of locality - a new interpretation with physical consequences*, 1997, unpublished, see at the web site http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/quant-ph/9706043

[3] L.Hardy, Phys.Rev.Lett. **71** 1665 (1993).

[4] J.S.Bell, Physics **1** 195 (1964).

[5] J.F.Clauser, and M.A.Horne, Phys.Rev. D **10**, 526 (1974).

[6] J.F.Clauser, and A.Shimony, Rep.Prog.Phys. **41**, 1881 (1978).

[7] B. d'Espagnat, Phys.Rep. **110** 201 (1984).

[8] D.M.Greenberger, M.A.Horne, and A.Zeilinger, in *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory, and Conceptions of the Universe*, edited by M.Kafatos (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 1989) pp. 73-76.

[9] N.D.Mermin, Am.J.Phys. **58**, 731 (1990).

[10] D.M.Greenberger, M.A.Horne, A.Shimony, and A.Zeilinger, Am.J.Phys. **58**, 1131 (1990).

[11] N.D.Mermin, Phys.Rev.Lett. **65**, 3373 (1990).

[5] In this case $|\xi_1^{(1)}>=|c_1>$ and $|\xi_2^{(1)}>=|d_1>$.

[6] If we try to compare them via extra measurements, these measurements will change the correlation. E.g. if we perform a nondisturbing measurement on P_1 still before the other two measurements in order to record the initial internal state of P_1, then the above joint probability becomes meaningful, but due to the measurement $P(a, b) = P(M_1, j, M_2, k)$ changes [2] so much that no contradiction can be constructed.